

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated February 28, 2006, claims 1-21 and 23-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent No. 6,182,279 (Buxton) in view of 5,758,154 to Qureshi.

Each of the independent claims have been amended to further define “command line utility.” It is apparent from the Office Action that the Examiner has construed the term “command line utility” very broadly, with the Examiner stating that the phrase “command line utility” appears to “mean a system call made by an executing application which results in the execution of [sic] a system utility.” 2/28/2006 Office Action at 5. It is respectfully submitted that such a broad construction is unreasonable. However, in an effort to achieve allowance of the present claims, each of the independent claims have been amended to recite that the command line utility is a utility executable from a command line prompt. Support for this amendment can be found at least on page 4, in the paragraph beginning at line 5, of the present Specification.

As conceded by the Office Action, Buxton fails to disclose a command line utility. 2/28/2006 Office Action at 4. The Office Action cited specifically to passages in Buxton referring to elements of an operating system that interact with a component system 200, where such elements of the operating system include an OLE container 220, OLE libraries 230, and application programming interfaces (APIs) 240. Buxton, 7: 51-61. As described by Buxton, the OLE container 220 interacts with the WIN32 APIs 240 through OLE libraries 230 to insert OLE objects or controls into an operating system registry. Buxton, 7:66-8:2. Examples of the OLE container that can interact with the WIN32 API 240 to insert OLE objects or controls into the operating system registry consist of Lotus Notes and Microsoft Word. Buxton, 8:2-6. As further explained in the cited passage, OLE libraries 230 include a set of system-level services in accordance with the OLE specification that function to call the WIN32 API to locate registry objects. Buxton 8:6-11. There is no teaching or suggestion anywhere in Buxton that the OLE container 220 (which can modify registry entries) can be substituted with a command line utility as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner relied upon Qureshi as disclosing a command line utility used in the context of claim 1, which was conceded by the Office Action as missing from Buxton. However, it is respectfully submitted that that Qureshi also does not teach or suggest use of any type of command line utility. The Office Action refers to registration routines described in Qureshi as

being the command line utility. The registration routines described in Qureshi include DllRegisterServer and DllUnregisterServer routines that are part of a registration DLL. Qureshi, 4:49-51; 8:17-21. These registration routines are *not* command line utilities. Therefore it is respectfully submitted that the hypothetical combination of Buxton and Qureshi would not teach or suggest all elements of each of the independent claims. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established with respect to the claims.

Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as corresponding independent claims. Allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, allowance of all claims is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees and/or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (MCT.0132US).

Respectfully submitted,



Date: May 25, 2006

Dan C. Hu
Registration No. 40,025
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, TX 77024
Telephone: (713) 468-8880
Facsimile: (713) 468-8883